REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the attention accorded to the instant application, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as amended.

Formal Matters

Claims 1, 3-23, and 28-29 are the claims currently pending the Application. Claims 1, 18-23, and 28-29 are amended herein to more clearly recite the invention. In particular, the word "downloadable" is replaced by "downloaded". Support for this amendment can be found on page 13, line 24 to page 14, line 5.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-23, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shigemi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,314,434 (hereinafter "Shigemi"). This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Among the problems recognized and solved by applicant's claimed invention is the need for a browser apparatus that can extend a markup language or meta-information. At present, if a user downloads an information service that includes extended markup language, the traditional browser cannot perform processing relating to the extensions, such as processing of a proprietary tag in a document. To overcome this problem, the present invention provides a browser capable of accessing a large variety of web pages, including those that make use of non-standard or extended functions. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 18-23, and 28-29, each recite "an application program downloaded when an information service requiring an extension of a markup language or meta-information is used" and further recite a document parser that responds to instructions from the downloaded application program.

The Examiner acknowledges that Shigema does not explicitly state a document parser, but contends that Shigema provides a suggestion of parsing SGML and XML data into structured document data (and/or nodes). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Shigema discloses a structured data management system in which a structured data object can be represented as a tree structure having a plurality of nodes (column 4, lines 20-28). Each individual node has a script to define its own local process (column 4, lines 61-62). Shigema further discloses SGML to enable the user to easily describe the system structure using DTD, and also discloses that "As an alternative to SGML, the Extensible Markup Language (XML), for example, can be used to produce DTDs." (column 9, lines 7-22) Shigema does not disclose or suggest any technique for producing DTDs, and, as the Examiner recognizes, does not explicitly state a document parser. In fact, Shigema teaches away from a document parser for converting document data into structured document information because, in his only reference to parsing, he teaches a script interpreter that <u>parses and executes</u> MIPS scripts (column 10, lines 27-29). The parsing and execution of an MIPS script does not create structured document information but instead "offers database access functions and linkage with other systems" and provides instructions for reading and writing SGML instances (column 10, lines 29-33).

Further, Shigemi does not disclose or suggest an application program, as recited in the independent claims of the present application. Consequently, Shigema does not disclose or suggest a document parser for converting document data into structured document information in response to an instruction from an application program, as recited in applicant's claims. Hence, applicant's independent claims are distinguishable from Shigemi.

It has been held by the courts that to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See, *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Further, the skill in the art component will rarely operate to supply missing knowledge or prior art to reach an obviousness judgment. *Al-Site Corp. v. VSI International Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 50 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999). As discussed above, Shagemi does not teach or suggest all features of independent claims 1, 18-23 and 28-29 and, in fact, teaches away from the feature of a document parser. Knowledge of one skilled in the art does not overcome this deficiency. Therefore, *prima facia* obviousness of the claimed invention has not been established. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 18-23 and 28-29 are patentably distinguished over any art of record in the application.

Further, claims 3-17 depend from independent claim 1, each dependent claim incorporating the novel and nonobvious features of the base claim. Hence, claims 3-17 are patentably distinguishable over the art or record in the application for at least the reasons that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the art of record in the application. Thus, applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the application. Should the Examiner have any

questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine R. Vieyra
Registration No. 47,155

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 (telephone)
(516) 742-4366 (facsimile)

KRV:vh

G:\NEC\1382\17261\Amend\17261.amd3.doc